

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant has canceled claim 33, and has amended claims 12, 18 and 27 to more properly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 12 – 15, 18 and 27 – 30 are presented for examination.

In Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 12 – 15, 18, 27 – 30 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that the limitation of *“automatically receiving from the program applet the embedded password without manual entry of the password by a user, for authentication whenever the receiving occurs”* is described in the original specification at page 12, lines 3 – 7, and designated by REQUEST, WITH PASSWORD, FOR INFORMATION in FIG. 6. The citation from page 11 indicated by the Examiner refers instead to the earlier stage of requesting the applet itself, which is designated by REQUEST FOR APPLET in FIG. 6.

In Paragraphs 5 – 9 the Examiner has reiterated the rejection, from the previous Office Action dated August 25, 2004, of Claims 12 – 14, 18, 27 – 29 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Scherpbier, U.S. Patent No. 6,263,365 (“Scherpbier”). Applicant has canceled claim 33 without acquiescence to the Examiner’s reasons for rejection and respectfully submits that rejection of that claim is thus rendered moot.

In Paragraphs 10 – 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner has reiterated the rejection, from the previous Office Action dated August 25, 2004, of claims 15 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherpbier.

In Paragraph 7 of the Office Action, in rejecting independent claims 12 and 27, the Examiner cites col. 4, lines 45 – 49 of Scherpbier, as disclosing *“providing a program applet (22) with a password embedded therewithin to a client computer.”* Applicant respectfully submits that the username and password of Scherpbier are provided to the control module (16) and not to the client computer (pilot computer 18). The control module resides on a server computer, as illustrated in FIG. 1 of Scherpbier and described at col. 3, lines 47 and 48. The present invention operates in the reverse direction to

Scherpbier; namely, the embedded password is provided by the server to the client, as illustrated in the direction of the arrow marked APPLET, PASSWORD in FIG. 1 of the present specification. Applicant has amended claims 12 and 27 to further clarify the limitation of transmitting the applet with the embedded password in the direction from the server computer to the client computer.

In Paragraph 13 of the Office Action, in the Response to Amendment, the Examiner has cited col. 3, lines 3 – 6 of Scherpbier as disclosing a code embedded in an applet. Applicant respectfully submits that the code referred to by Scherpbier corresponds to the flight number illustrated in elements 52 and 54 of FIG. 3, and described at col. 5, lines 13 – 22. The code is not embedded in an applet, since the applet is transmitted to the passenger computer (24) only after the code is received at control module (16) and validated.

The rejections of claims 12 – 15, 18 and 27 – 30 in paragraphs 5 - 12 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

As to amended independent method claim 12, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 12 of:

“transmitting a program applet with a password embedded therewithin from a server computer to a client computer, via a network, the password having a limited operational life” and

“receiving by the server computer, from said program applet at the client computer, via said network, (i) a request for information stored in a restricted access storage area of the server computer, and (ii) said embedded password”

are neither shown nor suggested in Scherpbier.

Because claims 13 – 15 and 18 depend from claim 12 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 – 15 and 18 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Scherpbier.

Accordingly claims 12 – 15 and 18 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 27, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 27 of:

“embed said password within said program applet, and transmit said program applet with said password embedded therewithin to a client computer via a network”; and

“receive from said program applet at the client computer, (i) a request for information, and (ii) said embedded password for authentication” are neither shown nor suggested in Scherpbier.

Because claims 28 – 30 depend from claim 27 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 28 – 30 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Scherpbier.

Accordingly claims 27 – 30 are deemed to be allowable.

Support for Amended Claims in Original Specification

Independent claims 12 and 27 have been amended to reflect the directions and designations of the arrows in FIG. 1 of the original specification. Dependent claim 18 has been amended to be consistent with the language of its parent claim 12.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Vladimir Sherman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,116

Dated: July 12, 2005

Eitan Law Group
C/O Landon IP, Inc.
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22314 USA

Tel.: 703 486 1150
Fax: 703 892 4510